arXiv:1403.1733v1 [hep-ph] 7 Mar 2014

UT-14-09
TU-957
IPMU14-0054

The 3.5 keV X-ray line signal from decaying moduli with low cutoff scale

Kazunori Nakayama[a,c], Fuminobu Takahashi[b,c] and Tsutomu T. Yanagida[c]

[a] *Department of Physics, University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan*
[b] *Department of Physics, Tohoku University, Sendai 980-8578, Japan*
[c] *Kavli Institute for the Physics and Mathematics of the Universe (WPI), TODIAS, University of Tokyo, Kashiwa 277-8583, Japan*

Abstract

The recent unidentified 3.5 keV X-ray line signal can be explained by decaying moduli dark matter with a cutoff scale one order of magnitude smaller than the Planck scale. We show that such modulus field with the low cutoff scale follows a time-dependent potential minimum and its abundance is reduced by the adiabatic suppression mechanism. As a result the modulus abundance can naturally be consistent with the observed dark matter abundance without any fine-tuning of the initial oscillation amplitude.

Recently, two groups reported strong evidence for the unidentified X-ray line at about 3.5 keV from various galaxy clusters and the Andromeda galaxy [1, 2]. While there may be systematic uncertainties relevant to these observations, the reported X-ray line could be due to the decay of 7 keV dark matter. It is worth noting that this interesting possibility was pointed out many years ago by Kawasaki and one of the present authors (TTY) in Ref. [3] (see also Refs. [4, 5]), where they studied decay of a light moduli field into photons in the gauge mediated supersymmetry (SUSY) breaking. After the discovery of the 3.5 keV X-ray line, there appeared various possibilities of producing the X-ray line by dark matter (DM) [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13]. In fact, the DM with mass and lifetime

$$m_\phi \simeq 7\,\mathrm{keV}, \tag{1}$$

$$\tau_\phi \simeq 2\times 10^{27} - 2\times 10^{18}\,\mathrm{sec}, \tag{2}$$

can explain the excess where ϕ denotes the DM particle [2]. Note that, if the DM decays into a pair of photons, a factor 2 needs to be multiplied with the lifetime. The task for the model building is how to realize such small DM mass, long lifetime as well as the correct DM abundance.

Let us focus on light moduli dark matter coupled to photons with a relatively low cutoff scale M [3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11]:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{\phi}{4M} F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\phi}{4M} F_{\mu\nu}\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu}, \tag{3}$$

where ϕ is a real scalar for the former, whereas it is a real pseudo-scalar for the latter. Since the moduli generally obtain mass from SUSY breaking effect, the moduli with mass of $\mathcal{O}(\mathrm{keV})$ naturally appears in the gauge-mediated SUSY breaking models, and its cosmological problem was studied in Refs. [3, 4, 14]. Assuming that the modulus decays mainly into photons through the above operator, the modulus lifetime is given by

$$\tau_\phi = \left(\frac{m_\phi^3}{64\pi M^2}\right)^{-1} \simeq 4\times 10^{27}\,\mathrm{sec}\left(\frac{7\,\mathrm{keV}}{m_\phi}\right)^3\left(\frac{M}{10^{17}\,\mathrm{GeV}}\right)^2. \tag{4}$$

Thus, the reported 3.5 keV X-ray line can be explained by the decaying moduli DM with $m_\phi \simeq 7$ keV, if the cutoff scale M is about one order of magnitude smaller than the Planck scale, $M_P \simeq 2.4\times 10^{18}$ GeV.[1]

[1] The suggested value of the cut-off scale is within the range naturally expected in string theory [6].

The potential problem of the light moduli dark matter scenario is that the modulus abundance may exceed the observed DM abundance by many orders of magnitude, which is known as the cosmological moduli problem [15, 16, 3, 14]. In this short note we point out that the moduli field with the low cut-off scale follows a time-dependent minimum and its subsequent oscillation amplitude is significantly reduced by the so called adiabatic suppression mechanism [17, 18, 19, 20, 21], and it can actually account for DM for appropriate choice of inflation energy scale.

The point is that the modulus field obtains a large Hubble mass of $\mathcal{O}(10) \times H$ with H being the Hubble scale, through the following coupling with the inflaton,[2]

$$K \supset \frac{b^2}{M^2}|\phi|^2|I|^2, \tag{5}$$

where I denotes the inflaton superfield and b is an order one numerical coefficient. Here we assume that the modulus field universally couples to other fields with the cutoff scale $M \sim 0.1 M_P$. In such a case, the amplitude of coherent oscillations of the modulus field is much suppressed because of the adiabatic suppression mechanism.

The coherent oscillation of the moduli in this case is induced only just after inflation when the adiabaticity of the modulus dynamics is temporarily violated, and as a result, its abundance is given by [19, 20, 21][3]

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\rho_\phi}{s} &\sim \frac{1}{8} T_{\rm R} \left(\frac{\phi_0}{M}\right)^2 \left(\frac{m_\phi}{c H_{\rm inf}}\right) \\ &\sim 4 \times 10^{-10}\,{\rm GeV} \left(\frac{T_{\rm R}}{10^4\,{\rm GeV}}\right) \left(\frac{\phi_0}{M}\right)^2 \left(\frac{M}{10^{17}\,{\rm GeV}}\right)^2 \left(\frac{m_\phi}{7\,{\rm keV}}\right) \left(\frac{10^7\,{\rm GeV}}{H_{\rm inf}}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $T_{\rm R}$ is the reheating temperature after inflation, $H_{\rm inf}$ is the Hubble scale during inflation and $c \sim M_P/M$. Note that we need $T_{\rm R} \lesssim \sqrt{m_\phi M_P} \sim 10^6\,{\rm GeV}$ in order for the adiabatic suppression to work. Otherwise, the universe is radiation dominated at the onset of moduli oscillation, during which the Hubble mass of the moduli is relatively suppressed [22].[4] Thus the light moduli with a keV mass can be a dominant DM for

[2] Note that, if ϕ respects a shift symmetry, $\phi \to \phi + i\alpha$ with α being a real parameter, the adiabatic suppression does not apply to the imaginary component of ϕ.

[3] The moduli abundance is *not* exponentially suppressed if one follows the modulus dynamics from during inflation. This is because the end of inflation necessarily breaks the adiabaticity, which induces the modulus oscillations [19].

[4] Even smaller cut-off scale for the interactions between the modulus and the standard model particles is needed for the adiabatic suppression mechanism to work in this case.

appropriate choices of $T_{\rm R}$ and $H_{\rm inf}$, without severe fine-tuning of the initial oscillation amplitude, contrary to the conventional wisdom.

Several comments are in order. Low scale gauge mediation models are consistent with the recent LHC data with 126 GeV Higgs boson, and may be tested at the 14 TeV LHC [23]. The gravitino thermal production can be suppressed if sparticles are as heavy as the reheating temperature. Another option is to introduce the late time entropy production: the dilution of the gravitino by a factor of $\mathcal{O}(100)$ is sufficient to avoid the gravitino overproduction [23]. In this case, the moduli abundance (6) is also reduced by the same dilution factor, but it can be compensated by the increase of the reheating temperature. Nonthermal leptogenesis may work if one assumes a mild degeneracy among right-handed neutrino masses. Finally, low inflation scale of $H_{\rm inf} \sim 10^7$ GeV is consistent with the SUSY new inflation scenario [24].

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Innovative Areas (No. 21111006 [KN and FT], No.23104008 [FT], No.24111702 [FT]), Scientific Research (A) (No. 22244030 [KN and FT], 21244033 [FT], 22244021 [TTY]), JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) (No.24740135) [FT], and Inoue Foundation for Science [FT]. This work was also supported by World Premier International Center Initiative (WPI Program), MEXT, Japan.

References

[1] E. Bulbul, M. Markevitch, A. Foster, R. K. Smith, M. Loewenstein and S. W. Randall, arXiv:1402.2301 [astro-ph.CO].

[2] A. Boyarsky, O. Ruchayskiy, D. Iakubovskyi and J. Franse, arXiv:1402.4119 [astro-ph.CO].

[3] M. Kawasaki and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **399**, 45 (1997) [hep-ph/9701346].

[4] J. Hashiba, M. Kawasaki and T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 4525 (1997) [hep-ph/9708226]; T. Asaka, J. Hashiba, M. Kawasaki and T. Yanagida, Phys.

Rev. D **58**, 083509 (1998) [hep-ph/9711501]; Phys. Rev. D **58**, 023507 (1998) [hep-ph/9802271].

[5] A. Kusenko, M. Loewenstein and T. T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. D **87**, no. 4, 043508 (2013) [arXiv:1209.6403 [hep-ph]].

[6] T. Higaki, K. S. Jeong and F. Takahashi, arXiv:1402.6965 [hep-ph].

[7] H. Ishida, K. S. Jeong and F. Takahashi, arXiv:1402.5837 [hep-ph]; see also id., arXiv:1309.3069 [hep-ph], to appear in Phys. Lett. B.

[8] J. Jaeckel, J. Redondo and A. Ringwald, arXiv:1402.7335 [hep-ph].

[9] H. M. Lee, S. C. Park and W. -I. Park, arXiv:1403.0865 [astro-ph.CO].

[10] D. P. Finkbeiner and N. Weiner, arXiv:1402.6671 [hep-ph].

[11] R. Krall, M. Reece and T. Roxlo, arXiv:1403.1240 [hep-ph].

[12] K. Kong, J. -C. Park and S. C. Park, arXiv:1403.1536 [hep-ph].

[13] M. Frandsen, F. Sannino, I. M. Shoemaker and O. Svendsen, arXiv:1403.1570 [hep-ph].

[14] S. Kasuya, M. Kawasaki and F. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 063509 (2002) [hep-ph/0108171].

[15] G. D. Coughlan, W. Fischler, E. W. Kolb, S. Raby, G. G. Ross, Phys. Lett. **B131**, 59 (1983); J. R. Ellis, D. V. Nanopoulos, M. Quiros, Phys. Lett. **B174**, 176 (1986); A. S. Goncharov, A. D. Linde, M. I. Vysotsky, Phys. Lett. **B147**, 279 (1984).

[16] T. Banks, D. B. Kaplan and A. E. Nelson, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 779 (1994) [hep-ph/9308292]; B. de Carlos, J. A. Casas, F. Quevedo and E. Roulet, Phys. Lett. B **318**, 447 (1993) [hep-ph/9308325].

[17] A. D. Linde, Phys. Rev. D **53**, 4129 (1996) [hep-th/9601083].

[18] F. Takahashi and T. T. Yanagida, JHEP **1101**, 139 (2011) [arXiv:1012.3227 [hep-ph]].

[19] K. Nakayama, F. Takahashi and T. T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 123523 (2011) [arXiv:1109.2073 [hep-ph]].

[20] K. Nakayama, F. Takahashi and T. T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 043507 (2012) [arXiv:1112.0418 [hep-ph]].

[21] K. Nakayama, F. Takahashi and T. T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **714**, 256 (2012) [arXiv:1203.2085 [hep-ph]].

[22] M. Kawasaki and T. Takesako, Phys. Lett. B **711**, 173 (2012) [arXiv:1112.5823 [hep-ph]]; Phys. Lett. B **718**, 522 (2012) [arXiv:1208.1323 [hep-ph]]; M. Kawasaki, F. Takahashi and T. Takesako, JCAP **1304**, 008 (2013) [arXiv:1211.4921 [hep-ph]].

[23] K. Hamaguchi, M. Ibe, T. T. Yanagida and N. Yokozaki, arXiv:1403.1398 [hep-ph].

[24] K. Nakayama and F. Takahashi, JCAP **1205**, 035 (2012) [arXiv:1203.0323 [hep-ph]]; see also JCAP **1110**, 033 (2011) [arXiv:1108.0070 [hep-ph]].